DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 053 470 32 EA 003 703

AUTHOR Cox, Arlie E.; And Others
TITLE Ohio Fifth Annual Evaluation Report of Title I, Fiscal Year 1970.
INSTITUTION Ohio State Dept. of Education, Columbus.
PUB DATE Nov 70
NOTE 48p.

EDRS PRICE EDRS Price MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS Academic Achievement, Achievement Gains, Community Involvement, *Compensatory Education, *Disadvantaged Youth, *Federal Programs, Inservice Education, Parent Participation, *Program Evaluation, Standardized Tests, Teacher Aides, Teacher Education, Test Results
IDENTIFIERS *Elementary Secondary Education Act Title I, ESEA Title I, Ohio

ABSTRACT

This evaluation attempts to measure the extent and effectiveness of ESEA Title I programs designed to meet the needs of disadvantaged children and apprizes the public and the legislature of program outcomes. In keeping with USOE requirements for evaluating Title I programs, this document is constructed of (1) response to USOE probes by questionnaire sequence, (2) applicable supplementary or background information, and (3) available related findings. Data were collected from the Ohio State Department of Education; reaction reports from teachers, administrators, and State ESEA Title I personnel; onsite visitations by Title I staff; and evaluation supplement and narrative reports distributed to local educational agency Title I directors and activity directors. (EA)

ED053470

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

The Fifth ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT of

TITLE I IN OHIO

EA 003 703

MARTIN ESSEX
State Superintendent of Public Instruction
Columbus, Ohio

1970

ED053470

THE FIFTH ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT OF TITLE I IN OHIO

FISCAL YEAR 1970

Prepared by

Arlie E. Cox, Chief, Basic Programs Section

Harold R. Hayden, Evaluator

Eileen Young, Consultant

G. ROBERT BOWERS
Assistant Superintendent, Instruction

R. A. HORN, Director
Division of Federal Assistance

STATE OF OHIO
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Columbus, Ohio

November, 1970

INTRODUCTION

This report has been prepared in compliance with the USOE's informal letter to State Title I Coordinators dated May 22, 1970, which prescribed evaluation data to be collected for ESEA Title I programs conducted during fiscal year 1970.

The report attempts to focus on the major factors of Ohio Title I programs as they contributed to serving 159,239 educationally disadvantaged children throughout the state. It also details the expenditure of $35,694,314 of Title I funds as used by 602 LEAs in programs designed to meet the varied needs of the educationally disadvantaged. (This figure of federal funds expended represents a total of all estimated costs reported by LEAs when they submitted fiscal year 1970 evaluation data. Final auditing will reflect minor differences resulting from final liquidation of funds encumbered before the end of projects.)

The report has been separated into two parts. Part I is concerned exclusively with answers to the questions posed in USOE's informal letter to state coordinators. Part II sets forth, in self-explanatory tables, comprehensive data about Title I activities in Ohio that are not reflected in the answers to the prescribed set of questions.

Data contained in the report represent 100 percent of the Title I projects funded and conducted in Ohio during fiscal year 1970. The data, therefore, should provide a sound statistical perspective of Title I programming in the state for the year.

PART I

PRESCRIBED EVALUATION INFORMATION FOR ESEA TITLE I PROGRAMS CONDUCTED IN OHIO DURING FISCAL YEAR 1970

PART I

PRESCRIBED EVALUATION INFORMATION FOR ESEA TITLE I PROGRAMS CONDUCTED IN OHIO DURING FISCAL YEAR 1970

I. Basic Statistics for Ohio ESEA Title I Programs

Number of LEAs	639
Number of LEAs participating in Title I	602
Number of LEAs participating in Title I during the regular school term only	157
Number of LEAs participating in Title I during the summer term only	101
Total number of LEAs participating in Title I during both the regular school and summer terms	344
Number of Title I projects conducted during fiscal year 1970	607
Unduplicated number of public school participants in Title I programs	152,039
Unduplicated number of non-public school participants in Title I programs	7,200
Total unduplicated number of participants in Title I programs	159,239

2. SEA Title I Staff Visits to LEAs and Other Leadership Services

During fiscal year 1970, each of seven staff members of the Division of Federal Assistance of the Ohio Department of Education worked with an average of 120 LEAs that were conducting Title I programs. These consultants spent a total of 384 days on field visits to 146 LEAs. Most field visits were multi-purpose in nature. Therefore, no one reason can be isolated for any one visit. On most field visits, however, primary consideration was given to key elements of ongoing program operation, to program evaluation and fiscal accountability, and to possible modification and improvement of future programs.

As an adjunct to and extension of field visits, the SEA in fiscal year 1970 conducted twenty regional meetings for LEA personnel. These meetings included six meetings for representatives from large cities and fourteen meetings for persons from smaller school districts. During the meetings, emphasis was placed on improving program quality, fiscal accounting, evaluative procedures, and parent participation. Apparent results of the meetings included increased interest by LEA personnel in fiscal accountability and in the involvement of parents in program planning and advisory committees.

Field visits and state-sponsored meetings do not begin to reflect the whole picture of leadership services provided by the SEA. Procedures in Ohio are such that SEA personnel are involved in all stages of LEA Title I programming. This involves:

- Provision of guidelines, application forms and instructions, and allocation information.
- Provision of consultant services, as requested, during planning and writing phases of program development.

- Review of proposed programs and negotiation with LEA personnel when proposed procedures are not in accordance with Title I guidelines.
- Provision of field services for previously mentioned purposes.
- Provision of evaluation instruments and related consultant services.
- Assistance with fiscal reporting responsibilities.
- Sponsorship of regional and state-level meetings, such as the regional meetings mentioned.
- Dissemination of information with the intent of keeping LEA personnel informed on the overall status of Title I in Ohio and on exemplary program activities of districts around the state.

The SEA strongly feels that by working with LEA personnel in all stages of Title I programming, more effective programs will be implemented. As a part of the SEA effort, the seven state consultants providing field services also conducted 867 office conferences involving LEA personnel.

3. SEA Procedural Changes and Their Effects

During the last three fiscal years, the SEA has exerted its influence upon LEAs in an ongoing effort to improve the quality of Title I programming, to insure equitable participation of non-public school children, and to modify programs (as needed) in light of local and state evaluation data.

A. Improving Program Quality

To improve the quality of Title I programming at the local level, SEA personnel stress the following criteria:

- Services should be concentrated on limited numbers of carefully selected children so that the amount of money available per child will equal at least one-half the district's annual per pupil expenditure from local and state sources.
- Program efforts should be concentrated within attendance areas with the highest priority needs, not spread thinly in all qualifying areas.
- Program activities should be tailored to meet identified needs of individual children.

- Parents should be actively involved in Title I programming, especially in planning and advisory capacities.
- Student-teacher ratios within major instructional areas of Title I programs should be quite low.
- Program efforts should be concentrated on younger children (grade three and below), so that emphasis can be placed on readiness or preventive measures rather than on remedial or corrective measures.
- Programs should operate during the regular term rather than during the summer term only. Summer term activities, if any, should be of a follow-up nature.
- Expenditures for equipment, materials, and supplies should be limited to those absolutely essential for the operation of the program.
- Services should be provided for eligible non-public children and for children residing in institutions as required by Title I guidelines.
- Supportive services should be provided to only those pupils who participate in major instructional areas.

The effects of these criteria can be measured only in so far as they meet the intent of the law. Local district changes directed toward meeting the criteria and toward improving program quality can neither be enumerated nor evaluated statistically. Subjective observations by SEA personnel suggest, however, that most local districts are making efforts along the aforementioned lines to improve program quality.

B. Insuring Participation of Eligible Non-Public School Children

The SEA insures participation of eligible non-public school children through its project application procedures. Each applicant LEA must describe in its proposal narrative the manner in which students residing in qualified attendance areas, who are enrolled in non-public schools, and who meet the selection criteria established in the project, are receiving the same consideration as children enrolled in public schools. On the application form,

anticipated numbers of non-public participants and their grade levels must be indicated. The site where services are to be provided to non-public students is also specified.

When field visits are made, non-public participation is one of the many considerations kept in mind. If necessary, districts are helped to make provisions through another LEA for providing services to eligible non-public students who are enrolled in buildings located outside the LEAs attendance boundaries.

Evaluation instruments provide follow-up information on numbers of students actually involved in each major instructional area during the regular and summer terms, respectively.

C. Modifying LEA Programs as Suggested by Evaluation Data

The limited financial resources provided by Title I necessitate a concentrated effort on a selected population in selected attendance areas in order to pave the way for effecting positive change. Recommendations for program modifications, which originate in part from SEA and/or local evaluation efforts, include:

- The use of Title I funds for summer term activities should be studied carefully. Although there is no conclusive evidence at this time that regular term programs are more effective than summer term programs, it is generally felt that summer term activities should be organized only to: (1) provide follow-up for those youngsters in regular term Title I activities, (2) act as orientation procedures to set the groundwork for educational programs which will begin the following fall, (3) provide those types of activities that were not possible during the regular school year but which apply to Title I participants who have been enrolled in regular term activities, and/or (4) effectively use funds reallocated so late that they cannot be used advantageously during the regular term.
- Provide for improved interrelationship and integration of Title I programs with regular term activities.
- Alter local Title I programs--as needed--by shifting emphasis, intensity, and duration in order to manipulate the impact on student behavior.

- Involve limited numbers of students to augment the possibilities of effecting measurable behavioral change.
- Provide for greater concentrations of services to those buildings with the highest incidence of economic deprivation.
- Maximize the effective use of teacher aides and other non-professional employees.
- Try approaches that seem to offer maximum services and activities within reasonable cost limits.
- Develop educational programming procedures that focus on readiness or preventative measures to increase the benefits of or make unnecessary remedial or corrective activities.
- Investigate other funding sources that can be used to supplement and/or expand services provided to educationally disadvantaged children.
- Incorporate Title I activities into the regular school program so that they become a part of the ongoing curriculum rather than adjuncts.

4. Effect Upon Educational Achievement

A discussion on the educational achievements of youngsters enrolled in Title I programs as if Title I operated in a vacuum is meaningless. Many other programs--including about 40 other federally funded programs and a number of state and local efforts in education, industry, labor, and welfare--are influencing the same youngsters. As a result of this great complexity of forces, no cause and effect relationship can be determined at the state level between Title I efforts and educational achievement. What can be measured, however, is how well children who were in Title I achieved over and above some arbitrary, reasonable expectation. The amount of change can be reported, but the cause cannot be determined.

A. Degrees of Change Reported for Participants in Communication (Reading, Language Arts) Major Instructional Areas

From Ohio's evaluation data collection instrument, the SEA gathered information relative to the degree of change that students

exhibited in their communication (reading, language arts) skills. LEAs were asked to classify each participant in this major instructional area into one of four degrees of change: marked improvement, improvement, some improvement, or little or no improvement. Arbitrary criteria established at the state level for these degrees of change, as measured by appropriate standardized instruments, were:

Marked Improvement--When a child gains 1.5 years or more in the course of a 10 month program, he is said to have made "marked improvement."

Improvement--When a student gains between 1.1 and 1.4 years inclusive in the course of a 10 month program, he is said to have made "improvement."

Some Improvement--When a child gains between .6 and 1.0 years inclusive in the course of a 10 month program, he is said to have made "some improvement."

Little or No Improvement--If a child gains .5 years or less during the course of a 10 month program, he is said to have made "little or no improvement."

Tables 1 and 2 set forth data on degrees of change by grade range as reported for regular and summer term participants in communication instructional areas (reading, language arts). Table 3 reports the same information with grade range data totaled. In each table, degrees of improvement are reported in two categories--those based on standardized test results and those based on subjective techniques such as questionnaires, locally constructed survey forms, and interviews. Items worthy of note include:

- 54% of all degrees of change based on standardized tests and reported for regular term participants, as totaled in Table 3, were for "marked improvement" or "improvement." An additional 23% were for "some improvement." This suggests that (with duplication discounted) 77% of the 79,725 regular term participants in this instructional area made at least some improvement.
- 53% of all degrees of change based on standardized tests and reported for summer term participants were for "marked improvement" or "improvement." An additional 29% were for "some improvement." This suggests that 82% of the 70,022 summer term participants, many of whom were also regular term participants, made at least some improvement.

TABLE I. DEGREES OF CHANGE REPORTED FOR TITLE I PARTICIPANTS IN REGULAR TERM COMMUNICATION (READING, LANGUAGE ARTS) MAJOR INSTRUCTIONAL AREAS BY GRADE RANGE AS MEASURED BY STANDARDIZED TESTS AND SUBJECTIVE TECHNIQUES IN OHIO IN FISCAL YEAR 1970

Participants	Grade Range	Degree of Change	Standardized Tests		Subjective Techniques	
			Times Reported*	Percent	Times Reported	Percent
2,345	PreK - K	Marked Improvement	455	32%	72	17%
		Improvement	460	33	225	53
		Some Improvement	286	20	55	13
		Little or No Improvement	206	15	72	17
		TOTALS	1,407	100	424	100
37,859	1 - 3	Marked Improvement	11,439	31	3,353	27
		Improvement	8,860	24	4,820	38
		Some Improvement	8,812	24	2,784	22
		Little or No Improvement	8,352	21	1,667	13
		TOTALS	37,463	100	12,624	100
24,846	4 - 6	Marked Improvement	9,997	34	2,559	26
		Improvement	5,718	19	3,312	33
		Some Improvement	6,720	23	2,732	27
		Little or No Improvement	6,908	24	1,425	14
		TOTALS	29,343	100	10,028	100
12,756	7 - 9	Marked Improvement	5,547	37	1,096	22
		Improvement	2,728	18	1,661	34
		Some Improvement	2,926	20	1,122	23
		Little or No Improvement	3,722	25	1,017	21
		TOTALS	14,923	100	4,896	100
1,919	10 - 12	Marked Improvement	659	28	437	33
		Improvement	480	21	407	31
		Some Improvement	576	25	266	20
		Little or No Improvement	613	26	213	16
		TOTALS	2,328	100	1,323	100

*Duplicated when individual student changes were reported for more than one standardized test and/or subjective technique.

TABLE 2. DEGREES OF CHANGE REPORTED FOR TITLE I PARTICIPANTS IN SUMMER TERM COMMUNICATION (READING, LANGUAGE ARTS) MAJOR INSTRUCTIONAL AREAS BY GRADE RANGE AS MEASURED BY STANDARDIZED TESTS AND SUBJECTIVE TECHNIQUES IN OHIO IN FISCAL YEAR 1970

Participants	Grade Range	Degree of Change	Standardized Tests		Subjective Techniques	
			Times Reported*	Percent	Times Reported	Percent
5,069	PreK - K	Marked Improvement	238	27%	180	24%
		Improvement	163	19	293	38
		Some Improvement	188	21	202	27
		Little or No Improvement	292	33	87	11
		TOTALS	881	100	762	100
36,676	1 - 3	Marked Improvement	9,739	29	3,498	20
		Improvement	8,941	26	5,078	29
		Some Improvement	8,480	25	6,577	37
		Little or No Improvement	6,611	20	2,470	14
		TOTALS	33,771	100	17,623	100
18,093	4 - 6	Marked Improvement	6,628	28	2,199	22
		Improvement	5,229	21	3,083	32
		Some Improvement	8,412	35	2,919	30
		Little or No Improvement	3,744	16	1,592	16
		TOTALS	24,013	100	9,793	100
7,386	7 - 9	Marked Improvement	917	25	337	22
		Improvement	1,012	28	488	32
		Some Improvement	1,034	29	418	28
		Little or No Improvement	664	18	262	18
		TOTALS	3,627	100	1,505	100
2,798	10 - 12	Marked Improvement	156	14	77	25
		Improvement	351	31	110	36
		Some Improvement	495	44	84	27
		Little or No Improvement	125	11	36	12
		TOTALS	1,127	100	307	100

*Duplicated when individual student changes were reported for more than one standardized test and/or subjective technique.

TABLE 3. DEGREES OF CHANGE REPORTED FOR ALL REGULAR AND SUMMER TITLE I PARTICIPANTS IN COMMUNICATION (READING, LANGUAGE ARTS) MAJOR INSTRUCTIONAL AREAS AS MEASURED BY STANDARDIZED TESTS AND SUBJECTIVE TECHNIQUES IN OHIO IN FISCAL YEAR 1970

DEGREES OF CHANGE REPORTED FOR 79,725 REGULAR TERM PARTICIPANTS

Degrees of Change	Standardized Tests		Subjective Techniques	
	Times Reported*	Percent	Times Reported	Percent
Marked Improvement	28,097	33%	7,515	26%
Improvement	18,246	21	10,425	35
Some Improvement	19,320	23	6,959	24
Little or No Improvement	19,801	23	4,394	15
TOTALS	85,464	100	29,293	100

DEGREES OF CHANGE REPORTED FOR 70,022 SUMMER TERM PARTICIPANTS

Degrees of Change	Standardized Tests		Subjective Techniques	
	Times Reported	Percent	Times Reported	Percent
Marked Improvement	17,678	29%	6,291	20%
Improvement	15,696	24	9,052	32
Some Improvement	18,609	29	10,200	34
Little or No Improvement	11,436	18	4,447	14
TOTALS	63,419	100	29,990	100

*Duplicated when individual student changes were reported for more than one standardized test and/or subjective technique.

B. Characteristics of Successful Title I Programs

Common characteristics of Ohio Title I programs that have been most effective in improving the educational achievement of disadvantaged children cannot be stated specifically. What is successful in one LEA where it has been determined that children have a certain set of needs may not be needed in another LEA or might not be successful if incorporated into the program.

Subjective analysis of Title I programs conducted in Ohio during fiscal year 1970 does, however, suggest that the more successful programs contained the following elements or procedures:

- The administration was vitally insterested in providing quality instruction of a concentrated nature to carefully selected children in attendance areas with the highest priorities of need.
- One major instructional area--oftentimes the only one--was Communication (Reading, Language Arts).
- Priority was given to regular term activities, with summer term activities--if any--of a follow-up nature.
- Programming was concentrated on younger children--grade three and below.
- Participants were provided daily instruction for the duration of the program.
- Supportive services were an integral part of the program.
- Inservice training efforts--including coordinated teacher/teacher aide activities--were well planned and of an in-depth nature.

5. Impact of Title I on Administrative Structures and Educational Practices

Title I, since its inception in 1965, has made a lasting impact on administrative structures and educational practices at both state and local levels. To a lesser extent, it has affected non-public school structures and practices.

A. Impact of Title I at the State Level

ESEA Title I focuses on the problems of the educationally disadvantaged child. As a result of this emphasis, people around Ohio and their elected representatives have become increasingly aware of the magnitude and complexity of the problems facing such children and of the need to provide more services. The 107th General Assembly, State of Ohio, enacted Senate Bill #350, thus becoming the first state in the Midwest to fund a program for disadvantaged children. This program in fiscal year 1970 provided over 16 million dollars in state funds to children in qualified Title I attendance areas.

Within the Ohio Department of Education, an administrative structural change that came about in 1965 was the creation of a Division of Federal Assistance, which is currently charged with SEA responsibilities related to Title I.

B. Impact of Title I at the LEA Level

An impact by Title I programming appears to have been made at the LEA level in the following ways:

- The "categorical" nature of Title I programs is accepted by most LEAs in the state.
- Concentrated Title I instructional activities and related supportive services are provided to selected children in a limited number of qualified buildings.

- Specialists are often employed to plan and implement Title I programs.
- Teacher aides are often employed to assist Title I teachers.

Effects of the impact of Title I programming at the LEA level include the following:

- LEAs are becoming increasingly concerned that Title I funds are inadequate for serving all children who are eligible by Title I guidelines. During fiscal year 1970, LEAs served 159,239 youngsters and indicated that another 184,932 were eligible, but not served. (See Table 4.)
- LEAs are also concerned that, because of limited Title I funds, they must concentrate services in a limited number of buildings that can be qualified. (See Table 4 for details.)
- The State of Ohio and LEAs have become convinced of the value of compensatory education concepts to the extent that 18 million dollars was provided from other funding sources. (See Table 5.)
- LEAs are providing, with state and local funds, more supplies and materials than ever before. Title I activities pointed out the need for new and greater quantities of materials and supplies.
- The experience gained by LEAs in using teacher aides in Title I activities has led some districts to employ aides as regular staff members in an effort to provide teachers with a better framework for individualized instruction.

C. Impact of Title I on Non-Public Schools

The efforts of the SEA and LEAs to insure proper non-public school participation in Title I programs in Ohio have been far-reaching. Prior to Title I, there was little or no communication between public and non-public school administrators in Ohio. Since Title I has been in existence, the emerging trend has been for the employment of liaison personnel, for the involvement of non-public personnel in comprehensive community planning, and for the establishment of cordial dialogues to discuss the planning and implementation of local Title I programs.

TABLE 4. PUBLIC SCHOOL DISTRICT PATTERNS IN OHIO RELEVANT TO THE AVAILABILITY AND PROVISION OF TITLE I SERVICES DURING FISCAL YEAR 1970

Public School District Patterns	Type of School District			State Totals
	City	Exempted Village	Local	
School buildings in Ohio	2,219	187	1,653	4,059
Buildings qualified for Title I services	1,231	157	1,350	2,738
Qualified buildings receiving concentrated Title I services	682	108	865	1,655
Qualified buildings receiving <u>some</u> Title I services	340	26	271	637
Qualified buildings receiving <u>no</u> Title I services	209	23	214	446
Reported enrollment of all school districts in Ohio . . .	1,439,094	97,216	818,547	2,354,857
Qualified students in Ohio receiving <u>no</u> Title I services during fiscal year 1970	144,449	3,409	37,074	184,932

TABLE 5. STATE, LOCAL, AND NON-TITLE I FEDERAL FUNDS USED TO SUPPORT TITLE I PROGRAMS AS REPORTED BY OHIO SCHOOL DISTRICTS IN FISCAL YEAR 1970

Type of Support	Reported Amounts
State funds provided for compensatory educational programs	$16,472,335
Local funds used to support Title I programs	1,426,143
Non-Title I federal funds used to support Title I programs	864,637
TOTAL	$18,763,115

The improved communications between public and non-public educators in planning programs and identifying needs helped pave the way for a state program of auxiliary services for non-public school students. This program in fiscal year 1970 provided over 17 million dollars of state funds to LEAs for programs for non-public students.

6. Additional Efforts to Help Disadvantaged Children

A. State Disadvantaged Pupil Programs

State funds were not used to augment Title I programs in the sense that money was comingled or spent on the exact same children as those involved in Title I programming. The 107th General Assembly, State of Ohio, enacted Senate Bill #350 which, as expanded by the 108th General Assembly, provided $16,472,335 during fiscal year 1970 for compensatory education programs. These programs were planned and implemented by LEAs for only those children in buildings designated as Title I eligible buildings. The following table lists the various types of programs and reports numbers of participants.

TABLE 6. TYPES OF PROGRAMS, NUMBERS OF PROGRAMS, AND NUMBERS OF PARTICIPANTS INVOLVED IN STATE-SUPPORTED COMPENSATORY EDUCATION PROGRAMS IN OHIO DURING FISCAL YEAR 1970

Type of Program	Number of Programs	Number of Participants
Health	40	144,946
Curriculum	16	90,329
Dropout Prevention	13	68,204
Communication Skills	11	62,073
Paraprofessionals	55	60,931
Miscellaneous	17	55,058
Counseling	33	52,774
Cultural Enrichment	28	39,102
Home-School and Adult Education	6	31,245
Library Services	27	28,856
Remedial	48	26,634
Motivational	11	24,357
Outdoor Education	7	12,080
Pupil-Staff Ratio	9	9,020
Special Tutoring	15	3,208
Disruptive Pupils	7	1,775
Executive Teacher	1	874
Take-Home Learning Kits	1	173
Inservice Training*	13	127,123
TOTALS	357	838,762

*Teachers are reported for this program only, all other participants were students.

B. Coordination Between Title I and Other Federally Funded Programs

Four examples of exemplary coordinated programs that can be cited are as follows:

- In the southern portions of Ohio a tri-county organization called PILASCO (an acronmyn for the county names--Pike, Lawrence, and Scioto) funded by ESEA Title III has been organized as an area service center. This center provides many services to LEAs in the tri-county area, including (1) the inservice training for Title I staff with special emphasis on teacher aide training; (2) supervision and coordination of services to LEA Title I programs; and (3) special supplementary services to Title I children such as psychological and health services and speech therapy.
- Title I, Head Start, and state compensatory funds have been coordinated (not comingled) in Barberton and South-Western city school districts. The funding procedure follows the same pattern in each instance: Head Start funds for preschool; state compensatory funds for kindergarten services; and Title I funds for services for first grade and above.
- In Newark and Xenia the summer preschool programs were co-funded by Title I and Head Start.
- Ohio had four Follow Through programs operating during fiscal year 1970. Cleveland City Schools operated a program for kindergarten, first, and second grade children. Dayton City Schools operated a program for kindergarten and first grade children. Akron and Martins Ferry City Schools operated a program for kindergarten children. The programs required that 15 percent of each budget be from Title I funds and 20 percent from state and local funds.

7. Evaluation of Non-Public Participation in Title I Programs

Tables 7, 8, and 9 respectively illustrate the procedures used by Ohio LEAs to involve non-public students in Title I activities, the kinds of resources shared with non-public schools, and the difficulties encountered in implementing Title I programs involving non-public students.

Over 200 of Ohio's 602 LEAs having Title I programs had non-public students as participants. This number must be considered along with the fact that only 264 of Ohio's LEAs have non-public buildings within their district attendance boundaries, let alone within the

TABLE 7. PROCEDURES UTILIZED BY LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCIES TO INVOLVE NON-PUBLIC STUDENTS IN TITLE I ACTIVITIES IN OHIO AS REPORTED FOR FISCAL YEAR 1970

Type of Procedure	Times Reported
Telephone contact	270
Personal contact with non-public schools	263
Close cooperation exists, no need to stimulate involvement	199
Written contact	164
Non-public school personnel actively involved in planning phases of the program	66
Liaison person hired or assigned by the public school	55
Revised course scheduling to facilitate non-public participation	48
Miscellaneous, including provision of transportation and contact with parents	20
Liaison person hired or assigned by the non-public school	16

TABLE 8. KINDS OF RESOURCES SHARED BY PUBLIC SCHOOL DISTRICTS WITH NON-PUBLIC SCHOOLS AS REPORTED BY OHIO LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCIES FOR FISCAL YEAR 1970

Kinds of Resources	Times Reported
Non-public pupils participate in Title I activities in public schools	199
Educational specialists sent to non-public schools	101
Miscellaneous arrangements for sharing, including testing assistance, joint meetings, and sharing of materials	62
Public school pupils participate in Title I activities at non-public schools	13

TABLE 9. DIFFICULTIES ENCOUNTERED IN IMPLEMENTING PROJECTS WITH NON-PUBLIC SCHOOL STUDENTS AS REPORTED BY OHIO LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCIES FOR FISCAL YEAR 1970

Types of Difficulties	Times Reported
Scheduling	143
Attendance areas	93
Transportation	86
Communication	74
Different needs	59
Non-public refusal	46
Different type of organization	45
Correlation of information systems	42
Better mutual understanding needed	36
Miscellaneous, including insufficient money and disinterest	33

building attendance boundaries that qualify for Title I services.

Specific numbers of the 7,200 non-public students involved in each of the various major instructional areas are reported as additional information in Tables 16, 17, 18, and 25.

8. Inservice Training

One area the SEA emphasized in working with the LEAs during fiscal year 1970 was inservice programs for professional and non-professional staff members. Tables 10 and 11 illustrate reported types of inservice training, numbers of persons involved, and hours of involvement. Items of particular interest include:

- 4,694 regular-term professional and 2,840 non-professional staff members within major instructional areas of Title I programs were involved in a total of over 162,000 hours of inservice training activities.
- 8,339 summer-term professional and 3,458 non-professional staff members were involved in a total of over 104,000 hours of inservice training activities.
- A combined total of 62,030 hours of involvement was reported for joint teacher/teacher aide training programs.

The following example is presented as typical of the inservice activities in many of the school districts in Ohio:

OREGON CITY TEACHERS LEARN ABOUT BEHAVIORAL OBJECTIVES

The Oregon City Schools, near Toledo, conducted a series of Title I inservice sessions during the regular and summer terms of fiscal year 1970. At one session, held in March, Mr. David Hamilton from School Management Institute made a presentation on "The Use of Objectives in Curriculum Organization."

Following the presentation, the teachers viewed filmstrips and heard records pertinent to behavioral objectives and preparing instructional objectives. Mini-course worksheets were used by those involved to develop and to reinforce understandings.

During the session, the teachers learned to recognize educational objectives, select appropriate objectives, recognize major components of an objective, define content for objectives, and identify affective objectives.

TABLE 10. PROFESSIONAL STAFF PARTICIPATION AND HOURS OF INVOLVEMENT IN VARIOUS TYPES OF INSERVICE TRAINING ACTIVITIES IN OHIO DURING FISCAL YEAR 1970

Type of Inservice Training	Regular Term		Summer Term	
	Persons Participating*	Hours of Involvement	Persons Participating	Hours of Involvement
Programs conducted by local administration	2,597	31,843	5,642	32,139
Conferences/workshops	2,351	27,951	3,127	19,535
Coordinated teacher-teacher aide training programs	1,285	15,223	2,262	10,083
University courses	353	10,898	118	2,398
Miscellaneous, including visiting consultants, county meetings, and state meetings	534	5,910	567	6,005
Visitations to other schools	1,199	9,122	532	1,988
TOTALS†	8,319	100,947	12,248	72,148
Unduplicated numbers of professional staff members	4,694		8,339	

*Duplicated to the extent that part-time professional staff members were involved in more than one major instructional area.

†Participant totals are further duplicated to the extent that staff members were involved in more than one type of inservice training activity.

TABLE 11. NON-PROFESSIONAL STAFF PARTICIPATION AND HOURS OF INVOLVEMENT IN VARIOUS TYPES OF INSERVICE TRAINING ACTIVITIES IN OHIO DURING FISCAL YEAR 1970

Type of Inservice Training	Regular Term		Summer Term	
	Persons Participating*	Hours of Involvement	Persons Participating	Hours of Involvement
Coordinated teacher-teacher aide training programs	1,155	26,288	1,532	10,436
Programs conducted by local administrators	1,468	18,283	1,688	8,983
Conferences/workshops	1,039	7,779	1,498	6,198
Miscellaneous, including county meetings	184	2,281	366	5,648
University courses	85	5,275	39	705
Visitations to other schools	258	1,041	334	685
TOTALS†	4,189	61,307	5,457	32,655
Unduplicated numbers of non-professional staff members	2,840		3,458	

*Duplicated to the extent that part-time non ofessional staff members were involved in more than one major instructional area.

†Participant totals are further duplicated to the extent that staff members were involved in more than one type of inservice training activity.

9. Parent and Community Involvement

The number of parents involved in Title I activities and the number of hours spent for various activities are reported in Table 12.

Observation of this table indicates:

- Over 4,000 parents of regular term participants spent an estimated 10,000 or more hours involved in the planning of Title I program activities.
- Over 3,200 parents of summer term participants spent nearly 8,000 hours involved in planning Title I program activities.
- On an estimated basis, 257,910 parent-hours of involvement were reported for the regular and summer terms of fiscal year 1970.

The Akron and Dayton City Schools, to cite two examples, had parent involvement activities that seem to be representative for the state:

DAYTON PARENTS INVOLVED IN EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION PROGRAM

With carefully planned parent involvement in all phases of the Dayton Early Childhood Education Program, there is an opportunity to bring about fundamental and lasting changes in the total environment of children. Guided by a parent program consultant, parent activities functioned during the 1969-70 school year with parents themselves assuming a major role in planning.

In every center, at the beginning of the year and monthly thereafter, parents met with the parent program assistant for that center to plan the weekly meetings. Some centers delegated this responsibility to a planning committee, while in other centers, all parents were involved in the planning.

Generally, parent participation was of four types:

- Explanations and presentations by Title I staff members about children's experiences in preschool followed by discussion concerning such things as child development, home follow-up, or discipline.
- Participation with the children in activities such as snack preparation, story reading, or field experiences.
- Active involvement at meetings relating directly to the children's needs as making toys and instructional aids, sewing and mending clothes, and learning about nutrition and food preparation.
- Conferences with teachers, nurses, or social workers.

TABLE 12. ESTIMATED NUMBERS OF PARENTS INVOLVED IN TITLE I PROGRAMMING IN OHIO AND ESTIMATED HOURS OF INVOLVEMENT DURING FISCAL YEAR 1970

Type of Involvement	Regular Term		Summer Term	
	Estimated Number of Parents	Estimated Hours of Involvement	Estimated Number of Parents	Estimated Hours of Involvement
Group meetings for parents	29,487	56,219	11,266	21,273
Individual conferences	39,593	53,522	17,400	12,862
Home visits	28,416	32,474	15,274	11,322
Parental classroom visits	21,027	19,935	17,412	23,942
Parents involved in the planning	4,086	10,374	3,279	7,806
Parents serving on advisory committees	970	5,275	979	2,906
TOTALS*	123,579	177,799	65,510	80,111
Estimated unduplicated number of parents involved	62,285		38,879	

*Totals for estimated numbers of parents are duplicated to the extent that parents were involved in more than one activity.

A room was provided at each center for parents to use for social purposes as well as for meetings. There parents could use sewing machines and other equipment which might not be found in the homes. Care of babies and young tots was arranged during the parent meetings. At least once a month, meetings were of a more formal type. Some fathers attended night meetings.

City-wide parent meetings, begun in the 1968-69 school year, continued to be well-attended, bringing together parents from 22 centers. At one meeting, a Dayton-produced sensorimotor development film was shown, followed by a work period to make home-play items which could contribute to sensorimotor development. At another meeting, a police inspector discussed safety in the home and on the street. A popular meeting was a viewing of a Sesame Street film and discussion of its value for preschool children. The final city-wide meeting was a style show, organized by the parents themselves. Parents also toured community agencies and other places of interest, thus widening their knowledge of opportunities and services available in Dayton.

During the last two years, a ten-minute movie, "Parent Program Activities," was produced by the project staff. Plans are to use the film with new groups of parents to introduce them to the possibilities of organizing a parent program of high interest and value.

AKRON PARENT INVOLVEMENT IN TITLE I REMEDIAL READING

Parental involvement is becoming an increasingly important phase of Akron's Title I remedial reading program. In January, 1970, the Director of Supplemental Services, two reading curriculum consultants, and the coordinator of elementary school counselors met to explore ideas, plans, and procedures for involving parents of children enrolled in Title I remedial reading. It was decided to begin in-depth parental involvement on a pilot basis at three elementary schools. The schools selected had a representative cross-section of pupils and were staffed by experienced teachers and counselors.

The objectives underlying this particular attempt in parental involvement were threefold:

- To secure thoughts and ideas of parents of Title I children, and through involvement to reinforce the reading program offered these youngsters.
- To have parents work cooperatively with the school to enrich the experiences of their children both at school and in the home.
- To have parents serve as resource and liaison persons with the individual school communities in vital matters such as school financing, student unrest, and school policies which might need interpretation.

From February to June, 1970, each of the three pilot schools averaged two parent meetings per month. The first meetings were planned and coordinated by the school principal, reading teachers, and counselors. For subsequent meetings, every effort was made to have parents plan their own programs and to determine how they were to be involved.

Varied types of involvement transpired in each of the schools. As examples, parents observed reading classes, made trips to the public library, were introduced to school learning resource centers, and/or participated in workshops dealing with such topics as instructional materials used in remedial reading, overhead projectors and tape recorders, and the importance of the individual tutoring process.

The described efforts in parental involvement were so successful that similar activities are now underway in all 18 elementary schools served by Title I during fiscal year 1971. Thus, more and more parents are being involved in the planning, operation, and evaluation of Akron's Title I program.

PART II

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

RELATED TO ESEA TITLE I PROGRAMS

CONDUCTED IN OHIO DURING

FISCAL YEAR 1970

TABLE 13. EXPENDITURES OF FUNDS, AVERAGE DAILY MEMBERSHIP OF PARTICIPANTS, AND PER PUPIL EXPENDITURES FOR TITLE I PROGRAMS CONDUCTED IN OHIO DURING FISCAL YEAR 1970

Reported Expenditures of Title I Funds	
Regular term activities	$24,770,700
Summer term activities	10,923,614
Total expenditures for fiscal year 1970	$35,694,314
Average Daily Membership of Title I Participants	
Regular term average daily membership	89,874
Summer term average daily membership	77,705
Per Pupil Expenditure, Based on Average Daily Membership	
Average participant, regular term only	$276
Average participant, summer term only	$141
Average participant, both regular and summer term	$417

TABLE 14. FOUR-YEAR EXPENDITURE TRENDS FOR ESEA TITLE I PROGRAMS DESIGNED TO MEET THE NEEDS OF EDUCATIONALLY DISADVANTAGED CHILDREN IN OHIO

Expenditure Category	Percent of All Fiscal Year Expenditures			
	Fiscal 1967	Fiscal 1968	Fiscal 1969	Fiscal 1970
Salaries for instructional staff	56.6%	66.0%	71.2%	73.5%
Employee benefits	7.5	8.2	9.0	10.3
Administration	6.6	5.9	4.9	3.5
Non-salary instructional expenditures including contracted services and educational supplies . .	11.2	7.4	5.7	6.2
Initial or additional equipment	6.9	2.7	2.0	0.8
Health services	2.5	3.3	2.7	1.5
Food services	1.2	1.1	0.9	0.9
Pupil transportation services	2.3	1.9	1.4	1.4
Operation and maintenance of plant	2.4	1.5	1.5	1.7
Remodeling/construction. .	2.1	1.6	0.4	0.1
Other expenditures	0.7	0.4	0.3	0.1
Total expenditures*	$32,386,502	$32,168,774	$30,512,493	$35,694,314

*Expenditures for fiscal years 1967-69 are from fiscal reports and are adjusted to June 30, 1970. For 1970, estimated expenditures are from evaluation instruments.

TABLE 15. REGULAR AND SUMMER TERM MAJOR INSTRUCTIONAL AREAS WITHIN TITLE I PROGRAMS CONDUCTED IN OHIO DURING FISCAL YEAR 1970

Major Instructional Area	Regular Term	Summer Term	Total	Percent of Total
Communication (Reading, Language Arts)	480	422	902	78%
Mathematics and/or Science	23	80	103	9
Vocational Education	13	14	27	2
Tutorial Services	28	21	49	4
Preschool Education	9	25	34	3
Special Education	31	14	45	4
TOTALS	584	576	1,160	100%

TABLE 16. REGULAR TERM EXPENDITURES AND NUMBERS OF PUBLIC AND NON-PUBLIC SCHOOL PARTICIPANTS FOR MAJOR INSTRUCTIONAL AREAS WITHIN TITLE I PROGRAMS CONDUCTED IN OHIO DURING FISCAL YEAR 1970

Major Instructional Area	Funds Expended or Encumbered	Participants		
		Public School	Non-Public School	Totals
Communication (Reading, Language Arts)	$17,994,990	75,726	3,999	79,725
Mathematics and/or Science	1,245,490	5,335	185	5,520
Vocational Education	396,680	1,048	17	1,065
Tutorial Services	1,542,269	12,655	588	13,243
Preschool Education	2,624,713	5,890	1	5,891
Special Education	966,558	2,076	13	2,089
TOTALS*	$24,770,700	102,730	4,803	107,533

*Horizontal participant totals include duplication to the extent that individual participants were involved in more than one major instructional area.

TABLE 17. SUMMER TERM EXPENDITURES AND NUMBERS OF PUBLIC AND NON-PUBLIC SCHOOL PARTICIPANTS FOR MAJOR INSTRUCTIONAL AREAS WITHIN TITLE I PROGRAMS CONDUCTED IN OHIO DURING FISCAL YEAR 1970

Major Instructional Area	Funds Expended or Encumbered	Participants		
		Public School	Non-Public School	Totals
Communication (Reading, Language Arts)	$ 7,726,652	63,018	7,004	70,022
Mathematics and/or Science	1,759,369	29,155	846	30,001
Vocational Education	148,550	980	70	1,050
Tutorial Services	874,241	9,691	208	9,899
Preschool Education	333,546	2,648	37	2,685
Special Education	81,256	472	58	530
TOTALS*	$10,923,614	105,964	8,223	114,187

*Horizontal participant totals include duplication to the extent that individual participants were involved in more than one major instructional area.

TABLE 18. COMPOSITE OF REGULAR AND SUMMER TERM TITLE I EXPENDITURES AND DUPLICATED NUMBERS OF PUBLIC AND NON-PUBLIC SCHOOL PARTICIPANTS FOR MAJOR INSTRUCTIONAL AREAS WITHIN TITLE I PROGRAMS CONDUCTED DURING FISCAL YEAR 1970

Major Instructional Area	Funds Expended or Encumbered	Duplicated Numbers of Participants*		
		Public School	Non-Public School	Totals
Communication (Reading, Language Arts)	$25,721,642	138,744	11,003	149,747
Mathematics and/or Science	3,004,859	34,490	1,031	35,521
Vocational Education	545,230	2,028	87	2,115
Tutorial Services	2,416,510	22,346	796	23,142
Preschool Education	2,958,259	8,538	38	8,576
Special Education	1,047,814	2,548	71	2,619
TOTALS	$35,694,314	208,694	13,026	221,720

*Numbers of participants and participant totals are duplicated to the extent that individual participants were involved in more than one major instructional area and/or involved in both regular and summer term activities.

TABLE 19. REGULAR TERM EXPENDITURE PATTERNS FOR MAJOR INSTRUCTIONAL AREAS WITHIN TITLE I PROGRAMS CONDUCTED IN OHIO DURING FISCAL YEAR 1970

Major Instructional Area / Category	Staff Expansion/ Extended Time of Current Staff	Inservice Training	Equipment	Educational Materials and Supplies	Transportation	Other	Totals
Communication (Reading, Language Arts)	$16,596,347	96,818	144,753	487,339	97,637	572,096	$17,994,990
Mathematics and/or Science	1,090,408	4,768	19,273	44,138	7,780	79,123	1,245,490
Vocational Education	335,195	4,344	1,768	18,288	4,631	32,454	396,680
Tutorial Services	1,401,040	9,646	4,341	21,660	3,739	101,843	1,542,269
Preschool Education	1,847,196	140,510	8,397	56,995	14,783	556,832	2,624,713
Special Education	814,052	1,381	7,567	23,292	56,326	63,940	966,558
TOTALS	$22,084,238	257,467	186,099	651,712	184,896	1,406,288	$24,770,700

TABLE 20. SUMMER TERM EXPENDITURE PATTERNS FOR MAJOR INSTRUCTIONAL AREAS WITHIN TITLE I PROGRAMS CONDUCTED IN OHIO DURING FISCAL YEAR 1970

Major Instructional Area \ Category	Staff Expansion/ Extended Time of Current Staff	Inservice Training	Equipment	Educational Materials and Supplies	Transportation	Other	Totals
Communication (Reading, Language Arts)	$6,005,117	149,688	148,106	582,952	283,360	557,429	$ 7,726,652
Mathematics and/or Science	1,276,653	25,832	5,377	126,469	54,321	270,717	1,759,369
Vocational Education	104,435	5,529	2,347	10,428	8,834	16,977	148,550
Tutorial Services	711,491	4,187	5,047	44,437	14,217	94,862	874,241
Preschool Education	267,796	13,076	3,154	16,441	13,416	19,663	333,546
Special Education	64,518	886	2,066	5,397	4,325	4,064	81,256
TOTALS	$8,430,010	199,198	166,097	786,124	378,473	963,712	$10,923,614

TABLE 21. COMPOSITE OF REGULAR AND SUMMER TERM EXPENDITURE PATTERNS FOR MAJOR INSTRUCTIONAL AREAS WITHIN TITLE I PROGRAMS CONDUCTED IN OHIO DURING FISCAL YEAR 1970

Major Instructional Area / Category	Staff Expansion/ Extended time of Current Staff	Inservice Training	Equipment	Educational Materials and Supplies	Transportation	Other	Totals
Communication (Reading, Language Arts)	$22,601,464	246,506	292,859	1,070,291	380,997	1,129,525	$25,721,642
Mathematics and/or Science	2,367,061	30,600	24,650	170,607	62,101	349,840	3,004,859
Vocational Education	439,630	9,873	4,115	28,716	13,465	49,431	545,230
Tutorial Services	2,112,531	13,833	9,388	66,097	17,956	196,705	2,416,510
Preschool Education	2,114,992	153,586	11,551	73,436	28,199	576,495	2,958,259
Special Education	878,570	2,267	9,633	28,689	60,651	68,004	1,047,814
TOTALS	$30,514,248	456,665	352,196	1,437,836	563,369	2,370,000	$35,694,314

TABLE 22. REGULAR TERM PUBLIC SCHOOL PARTICIPANTS, BY GRADE, FOR MAJOR INSTRUCTIONAL AREAS WITHIN TITLE I PROGRAMS CONDUCTED IN OHIO DURING FISCAL YEAR 1970

MIA* / Grade	Communication (Reading, Language Arts)	Mathematics and/or Science	Vocational Education	Tutorial Services	Preschool Education	Special Education	Totals†
Pre-K	736			25	3,600	12	4,373
K	1,568			137	2,290	158	4,153
1	9,406	245		2,031		172	11,854
2	13,346	200		1,710		160	15,416
3	12,979	393		1,547		154	15,073
4	9,992	685	10	1,565		218	12,470
5	7,589	795	60	1,549		188	10,181
6	5,993	944	57	1,254		181	8,429
7	6,470	1,819	102	674		214	9,279
8	3,792	175	89	710		230	4,996
9	2,016	34	283	562		137	3,032
10	1,188	22	280	601		115	2,206
11	448	11	71	162		67	759
12	203	12	96	128		70	509
TOTALS	75,726	5,335	1,048	12,655	5,890	2,076	102,730

*Major instructional areas

†Vertical totals and the grand total are duplicated to the extent that individual participants were involved in more than one major instructional area.

TABLE 23. SUMMER TERM PUBLIC SCHOOL PARTICIPANTS, BY GRADE, FOR MAJOR INSTRUCTIONAL AREAS WITHIN TITLE I PROGRAMS CONDUCTED IN OHIO DURING FISCAL YEAR 1970

MIA* / Grade	Communication (Reading, Language Arts)	Mathematics and/or Science	Vocational Education	Tutorial Services	Preschool Education	Special Education	Totals†
Pre-K	2,414	1,956			1,994	48	6,412
K	2,511	1,002		108	636	114	4,371
1	11,487	3,015		1,146	11	51	15,710
2	11,185	2,930		1,316	6	68	15,505
3	10,052	3,004		1,624	1	81	14,762
4	7,665	3,326		1,576		37	12,604
5	5,463	3,036	13	986		28	9,526
6	2,625	964	50	905		31	4,575
7	3,961	3,992	99	319		9	8,380
8	1,783	2,079	154	297		5	4,318
9	1,153	1,461	139	1,004			3,757
10	1,381	1,202	156	197			2,936
11	819	725	230	139			1,913
12	519	463	139	74			1,195
TOTALS	63,018	29,155	980	9,691	2,648	472	105,964

*Major instructional areas

†Vertical totals and the grand total are duplicated to the extent that individual participants were involved in more than one major instructional area.

TABLE 24. COMPOSITE AND DUPLICATED COUNTS OF REGULAR AND SUMMER TERM PUBLIC SCHOOL PARTICIPANTS, BY GRADE, FOR MAJOR INSTRUCTIONAL AREAS WITHIN TITLE I PROGRAMS CONDUCTED IN OHIO DURING FISCAL YEAR 1970

Grade \ MIA*	Communication (Reading, Language Arts)	Mathematics and/or Science	Vocational Education	Tutorial Services	Preschool Education	Special Education	Totals
Pre-K	3,150	1,956		25	5,594	60	10,785
K	4,079	1,002		245	2,926	272	8,524
1	20,893	3,260		3,177	11	223	27,564
2	24,531	3,130		3,026	6	228	30,921
3	23,031	3,397		3,171	1	235	29,835
4	17,657	4,011	10	3,141		255	25,074
5	13,052	3,831	73	2,535		216	19,707
6	8,618	1,908	107	2,159		212	13,004
7	10,431	5,811	201	993		223	17,659
8	5,575	2,254	243	1,007		235	9,314
9	3,169	1,495	422	1,566		137	6,789
10	2,569	1,224	436	798		115	5,142
11	1,267	736	301	301		67	2,672
12	722	475	235	202		70	1,704
TOTALS	138,744	34,490	2,028	22,346	8,538	2,548	208,694

*Major instructional areas

TABLE 25. REGULAR AND SUMMER TERM NON-PUBLIC SCHOOL PARTICIPANTS, BY GRADE, FOR MAJOR INSTRUCTIONAL AREAS WITHIN TITLE I PROGRAMS CONDUCTED IN OHIO DURING FISCAL YEAR 1970

MIA* / Grade	Communication (Reading, Language Arts)		Mathematics and/or Science		Vocational Education		Tutorial Services		Preschool Education		Special Education		Totals†	
	R‡	S	R	S	R	S	R	S	R	S	R	S	R	S
Pre-K	4								1	37			5	37
K	37	144		57			1	3			10	10	48	214
1	478	1,268	4	95			110	101				6	592	1,470
2	816	1,502	21	113			96	11				11	933	1,637
3	834	1,182	4	128			105	32			1	16	944	1,358
4	554	942	21	127			96	12			1	8	672	1,089
5	421	776	46	142	7		99	9				5	573	932
6	297	622	37	74	4	5	73				1	1	412	702
7	269	254	30	43		8	4						303	305
8	159	151	9	39	1	13	4	7					173	210
9	50	84	10	24	1	8		33					61	149
10	50	41	1	3	3	17						1	54	62
11	14	38	2	1	1	17							17	56
12	16					2							16	2
Sub-Total	3,999	7,004	185	846	17	70	588	208	1	37	13	58	4,803	8,223
TOTALS	11,003		1,031		87		796		38		71		13,026	

*Major instructional areas
†R--regular term; S--summer term
‡Both vertical and horizontal totals include duplication to the extent that participants were involved in more than one major instructional are and/or involved in both regular and summer term activities.

TABLE 26. AVERAGE STUDENT-TEACHER RATIOS FOR REGULAR AND SUMMER TERM MAJOR INSTRUCTIONAL AREAS WITHIN TITLE I PROGRAMS CONDUCTED IN OHIO DURING FISCAL YEAR 1970

Average Student-Teacher Ratios Within Major Instructional Areas	Times Reported		
	Regular Term	Summer Term	Totals
1 to 1	11	11	22
2-5 to 1	298	144	442
6-10 to 1	254	300	554
11-15 to 1	34	102	136
More than 15 to 1	19	14	33

TABLE 27. PROFESSIONAL AND NON-PROFESSIONAL PERSONNEL EMPLOYED WITHIN MAJOR INSTRUCTIONAL AREAS OF TITLE I PROGRAMS CONDUCTED IN OHIO DURING FISCAL YEAR 1970

Personnel Category	Regular Term			Summer Term		
	Full-time	Part-time*	Totals	Full-time	Part-time*	Totals
Teachers	1,488	597	2,085	7,147	1,008	8,155
Guidance counselors	33	56	89	71	22	93
Psychologists	12	33	45	26	41	67
Social workers	35	20	55	32	13	45
Speech therapists	7	11	18	87	10	97
Librarians	5	10	15	173	34	207
Principals, and/or Ass't. Principals	6	18	24	217	16	233
Coordinators	57	162	219	214	113	327
Supervisors	23	28	51	55	40	95
Directors	20	41	61	86	41	127
Physicians		39	39	1	9	10
Nurses	33	35	68	80	24	104
Dentists	4	17	21	11	22	33
Attendance workers	2	3	5	60	60	120
Library aides	7	6	13	166	20	186
Teacher aides	1,041	432	1,473	2,534	355	2,889
Volunteers	12	14	26	36	170	206
Clerks, secretaries, consultants, student tutors, cooks, bus drivers, etc.	146	372	518	1,517	562	2,079
TOTALS	2,931	1,894	4,825	12,513	2,560	15,073

*Duplicated when persons were employed part-time in two or more major instructional areas.

TABLE 28. FULL-TIME AND PART-TIME TEACHERS IN FISCAL YEAR 1970 TITLE I PROGRAMS IN OHIO ACCORDING TO SPECIAL TRAINING, SKILLS AND/OR EXPERIENCE

Background Descriptors	Full-time Teachers	Part-time Teachers	Totals
Experienced teachers with special training or skills to teach disadvantaged youngsters	4,012	771	4,783
Experienced teachers with no prior training or experience in teaching disadvantaged youngsters	1,872	926	2,798
First year teachers with special training or skills to teach the disadvantaged youngster	147	71	218
First year teachers with no prior training or experience with the disadvantaged	306	116	422
TOTALS	6,337	1,884	8,221

TABLE 29. MAJOR PROBLEMS OF LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCIES IN PLANNING AND IMPLEMENTING TITLE I PROGRAMS AND TIMES REPORTED IN OHIO FOR FISCAL YEAR 1970

Major Problems	Times Reported
Problems in carry-over to regular academic program; problems in identification of students for participation in Title I	91
Insufficient funds	88
Scheduling problems	83
Lack of school/parent cooperation	79
Problems in motivation of students	74
Irregular attendance of participants	62
Problems in motivating staff support	54
Shortage of space/facilities	53
Shortage or delay of equipment/supplies and materials	46
Personnel shortages - teachers	42
Lateness of allocation	32
Transportation problems	27
Shortage of planning time	13
Excessive paper work	3